

Remarks

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-17 have been rejected by the Examiner. Claims 1 and 9 have been amended. Thus, claims 1-17 remain pending in the application.

Amendments and New Claims

Support for the amendments can be found on page 6, lines 10-13 of the present application.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

1. In “Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103” item 4 on page 4 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 1, 3-9, and 11-17 have been rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,763,095 to *Cermak et al.* (hereinafter “Cermak”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,333,973 to *Smith et al.* (hereinafter “Smith”) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

As amended, claim 1 recites a method comprising:

“receiving, by a wireless mobile communication device, a first user request from an input key of the wireless mobile communication device; and
in response, displaying, by the wireless mobile communication device, on a display of the wireless mobile communication device, a list of communication messages to and from a communication partner of at least two message types selected from a message type group comprising of an email message type, a text message type, a voice message type, and a call message type.”

Thus, when properly viewed as a whole, claim 1 teaches providing a user with a message listing comprised of messages of multiple types, and including messages to and from a communication partner. Thus, the user is able to have a

complete picture of all communication between him/herself and the communication partner.

In contrast, Cermak does not teach or suggest a message list having messages to and from a communication partner. Rather, Cermak simply teaches a system for identifying callers/senders to a called/messaged party to facilitate the party in determining whether to answer/respond. In one variation, Cermak discloses displaying the messages, such as call messages, IM messages, voicemail messages, and email messages, in a unified messaging mailbox. These messages, however, only include received messages from a communication party, not messages to that party.

Further, Smith does not cure this deficiency. Smith also shows a unified messaging mailbox, but does not describe or show any list having messages both to and from a communication partner. In fact, in Figure 7a of Smith, separate tabs are shown for separate received and sent lists. Thus, Smith not only fails to disclose a single list having both sent and received messages, but also teaches away from such a list by showing separate lists for sent messages and received messages.

Accordingly, amended claim 1 is patentable over Cermak and Smith, alone or in combination, under 35 USC §103(a).

Amended claim 9 recites limitations similar to those of amended claim 1. Thus, for at least the same reasons, claim 9 is patentable over Cermak and Smith, alone or in combination, under §103(a).

Claims 3-8 and 11-17 depend from claims 1 and 9, incorporating their limitations respectively. Thus, for at least the same reasons, claims 3-8 and 11-17 are patentable over Cermak and Smith, alone or in combination, under §103(a).

2. In “Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103” item 5 on page 9 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 2 and 10 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Cermak in view of Smith, and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0177471 to *Kaaresoja et al.* (hereinafter “Kaaresoja”) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Kaaresoja does not cure the deficiencies of Cermak and Smith. Accordingly, claims 1 and 9 remain patentable over Cermak, Smith, and Kaaresoja, alone or in combination, for at least the reasons given above.

Claims 2 and 10 depend from claims 1 and 9, incorporating their limitations, respectively. Accordingly, claims 2 and 10 are patentable over Cermak, Smith, and Kaaresoja, alone or in combination, under §103(a).

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-17 are solicited. As a result of the amendments made herein, Applicants submit that claims 1-17 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present paper, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (206) 407-1513. If any fees are due in connection with filing this paper, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the Deposit Account of Schwabe, Williamson and Wyatt, P.C., No. 50-0393.

Respectfully submitted,
SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.

Date: March 7, 2007

by: /Robert C. Peck/
Robert C. Peck
Reg. No.: 56,826

Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt, P.C.
Pacwest Center, Suites 1600-1900
1211 SW Fifth Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97222
Telephone: 503-222-9981